arXiv:1704.00508v1 [math.AP] 3 Apr 2017

On the second Dirichlet eigenvalue of some nonlinear anisotropic elliptic operators

Francesco Della Pietra, Nunzia Gavitone, Gianpaolo Piscitelli

Università degli studi di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Matematica e Applicazioni "R. Caccioppoli"
Via Cintia, Monte S. Angelo - 80126 Napoli, Italia.[*]

April 4, 2017

Let Ω be a bounded open set of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geqslant 2$. In this paper we mainly study some properties of the second Dirichlet eigenvalue $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$ of the anisotropic p-Laplacian

$$-\mathcal{Q}_p u := -\operatorname{div}\left(F^{p-1}(\nabla u)F_\xi(\nabla u)\right),$$

where F is a suitable smooth norm of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $p \in]1,+\infty[$. We provide a lower bound of $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$ among bounded open sets of given measure, showing the validity of a Hong-Krahn-Szego type inequality. Furthermore, we investigate the limit problem as $p \to +\infty$.

MSC 2010: 35P15 - 35P30 - 35J60
Keywords: Nonlinear eigenvalue problems - Hong-Krahn-Szego inequality - Finsler metrics

1 INTRODUCTION

Let Ω be a bounded open set of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geqslant 2$. The main aim of this paper is to study some properties of the Dirichlet eigenvalues of the anisotropic p-Laplacian operator:

$$-\mathcal{Q}_p u := -\operatorname{div}\left(F^{p-1}(\nabla u)\nabla_\xi F(\nabla u)\right), \tag{1}$$

where $1 < p < +\infty$, and F is a sufficiently smooth norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (see Section 2 for the precise assumptions on F), namely the values λ such that the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{Q}_p u = \lambda |u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

admits a nontrivial solution in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

The operator in (1) reduces to the p-Laplacian when F is the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$. For a general norm F, $\mathcal{Q}_p$ is anisotropic and can be highly nonlinear. In literature, several papers

[*]Email: f.dellapietra@unina.it, nunzia.gavitone@unina.it, gianpaolo.piscitelli@unina.it

are devoted to the study of the smallest eigenvalue of (2), denoted by $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$, in bounded domains (see Section 2), which has the variational characterization

$$\lambda_1(p,\Omega) = \min_{\varphi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\displaystyle\int_\Omega F^p(\nabla\varphi)\,dx}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |\varphi|^p\,dx}.$$

Let Ω be a bounded domain. It is known (see [BFK, DG2]) that $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$ is simple, the eigenfunctions have constant sign and it is isolated; moreover the only positive eigenfunctions are the first eigenfunctions. Furthermore, the Faber-Krahn inequality holds (see [BFK]):

$$\lambda_1(p,\Omega) \geqslant \lambda_1(p,\mathcal{W}_R)$$

where $\mathcal{W}_R$ is the so-called Wulff shape, that is the ball with respect to the dual norm F^o of F, having the same measure of Ω (see Section 2). Many other results are known for $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$. The interested reader may refer, for example, to [BFK, BKJ, BGM, DG3, KN, P, WX]. As matter of fact, also different kind of boundary conditions have been considered as, for example, in the papers [DG, DGP] (Neumann case), [DG2] (Robin case).

Among the results contained in the quoted papers, we recall that if Ω is a bounded domain, it has been proved in [BKJ] that

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} \lambda_1(p,\Omega)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \frac{1}{\rho_F(\Omega)},$$

where $\rho_F(\Omega)$ is the anisotropic inradius of Ω with respect to the dual norm (see Section 2 for its definition), generalizing a well-known result in the Euclidean case contained in [JLM].

Actually, very few results are known for higher eigenvalues in the anisotropic case. In [F] the existence of a infinite sequence of eigenvalues is proved, obtained by means of a $\min-\max$ characterization. Actually, as in the Euclidean case, it is not known if this sequence exhausts all the set of the eigenvalues. Here we will show that the spectrum of $-\Omega_p$ is a closed set, that the eigenfunctions are in $C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ and that admit a finite number of nodal domains. We recall the reference [L2], where many results for the spectrum of the p-Laplacian in the Euclidean case have been summarized.

The core of the paper relies in the study of the second eigenvalue $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$, $p \in]1,+\infty[$, in bounded open sets, defined as

$$\lambda_2(p,\Omega) := \begin{cases} \min\{\lambda > \lambda_1(p,\Omega) \colon \lambda \text{ is an eigenvalue}\} & \text{if } \lambda_1(p,\Omega) \text{ is simple} \\ \lambda_1(p,\Omega) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and in analyzing its behavior when $p \to \infty$.

First of all, we show that if Ω is a domain, then $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$ admits exactly two nodal domains. Moreover, for a bounded open set Ω, we prove a sharp lower bound for λ_2, namely the Hong-Krahn-Szego inequality

$$\lambda_2(p,\Omega) \geqslant \lambda_2(p,\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}), \tag{3}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$ is the union of two disjoint Wulff shapes, each one of measure $\frac{|\Omega|}{2}$.

In the Euclidean case, such inequality is well-known for $p = 2$, and it has been recently studied for any $1 < p < +\infty$ in [BF2].

Finally, we address our attention to the behavior of $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$ when Ω is a bounded open set and $p \to +\infty$. In particular, we show that

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} \lambda_2(p,\Omega)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \frac{1}{\rho_{2,F}(\Omega)},$$

where $\rho_{2,F}(\Omega)$ is the radius of two disjoint Wulff shapes $\mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{W}_2$ such that $\mathcal{W}_1 \cup \mathcal{W}_2$ is contained in Ω. Furthermore, the normalized eigenfunctions of $\lambda_p(2,\Omega)$ converge to a function u_∞ that is a viscosity solution to a suitable fully nonlinear elliptic problem (see Section 5). In the Euclidean case, this kind of result has been proved for bounded domains in [JL]. We consider both the nonconnected case and general norm F. In a forthcoming paper we will deal with the limit case $p \to 1$.

As enhanced before, the aim of the paper is twofold: first, to consider the case of a general Finsler norm F; second, to extend also the results known in the case of domains, to the case of nonconnected sets. We structured the paper as follows. In Section 2 we recall the main definitions as well as some basic fact of convex geometry, and we fix the precise assumptions on F. In Section 3 we state the general eigenvalue problem for $-\mathcal{Q}_p$, recalling some known results, extending them, where it is possible, to the case of nonconnected sets; moreover we provide several properties of the first and of higher eigenvalues and eigenfunctions. In Section 4 the attention will be focused on the second eigenvalue $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$ of $-\mathcal{Q}_p$ proving, among the other properties of λ_2, the Hong-Krahn-Szego inequality. Finally, in Section 5 we study the limit case $p \to \infty$.

2 NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the paper we will consider a convex even 1-homogeneous function

$$\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto F(\xi) \in [0, +\infty[,$$

that is a convex function such that

$$F(t\xi) = |t|F(\xi), \quad t \in \mathbb{R},\ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{4}$$

and such that

$$a|\xi| \leqslant F(\xi), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{5}$$

for some constant $0 < a$. Under this hypothesis it is easy to see that there exists $b \geqslant a$ such that

$$F(\xi) \leqslant b|\xi|, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Moreover, throughout the paper we will assume that

$$\nabla^2_\xi[F^p](\xi) \text{ is positive definite in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}, \tag{6}$$

with $1 < p < +\infty$.

The hypothesis (6) on F assures that the operator

$$\mathcal{Q}_p[u] := \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{1}{p}\nabla_\xi[F^p](\nabla u)\right)$$

is elliptic, hence there exists a positive constant γ such that

$$\frac{1}{p}\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \nabla^2_{\xi_i\xi_j}[F^p](\eta)\xi_i\xi_j \geqslant \gamma|\eta|^{p-2}|\xi|^2,$$

for some positive constant γ, for any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Remark 2.1. We stress that for $p \geqslant 2$ the condition

$$\nabla^2_\xi[F^2](\xi) \text{ is positive definite in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\},$$

implies (6).

The polar function $F^o\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, +\infty[$ of F is defined as

$$F^o(\nu) = \sup_{\xi \neq 0} \frac{\langle \xi, \nu \rangle}{F(\xi)}.$$

It is easy to verify that also F^o is a convex function which satisfies properties (4) and (5). Furthermore,

$$F(\nu) = \sup_{\xi \neq 0} \frac{\langle \xi, \nu \rangle}{F^o(\xi)}.$$

From the above property it holds that

$$|\langle \xi, \eta \rangle| \leqslant F(\xi) F^o(\eta), \qquad \forall \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The set

$$\mathcal{W} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon F^o(\xi) < 1\}$$

is the so-called Wulff shape centered at the origin. We put $\kappa_n = |\mathcal{W}|$, where $|\mathcal{W}|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of $\mathcal{W}$. More generally, we denote with $\mathcal{W}_r(x_0)$ the set $r\mathcal{W} + x_0$, that is the Wulff shape centered at x_0 with measure $\kappa_n r^n$, and $\mathcal{W}_r(0) = \mathcal{W}_r$.

The following properties of F and F^o hold true (see for example [BP]):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \nabla_\xi F(\xi), \xi \rangle = F(\xi), \quad \langle \nabla_\xi F^o(\xi), \xi \rangle = F^o(\xi),\\
&F(\nabla_\xi F^o(\xi)) = F^o(\nabla_\xi F(\xi)) = 1, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\},\\
&F^o(\xi) \nabla_\xi F(\nabla_\xi F^o(\xi)) = F(\xi) \nabla_\xi F^o(\nabla_\xi F(\xi)) = \xi \qquad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we will recall the following

Definition 1. *A domain of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a connected open set.*

3 THE DIRICHLET EIGENVALUE PROBLEM FOR $-\mathcal{Q}_p$

Here we state the eigenvalue problem for $\mathcal{Q}_p$. Let Ω be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geqslant 2$, $1 < p < +\infty$, and consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{Q}_p u = \lambda |u|^{p-2} u & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Definition 2. *We say that $u \in W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$, $u \neq 0$, is an eigenfunction of (7), if*

$$\int_\Omega \langle F^{p-1}(\nabla u) \nabla_\xi F(\nabla u), \nabla \varphi \rangle \, dx = \lambda \int_\Omega |u|^{p-2} u \varphi \, dx \tag{8}$$

for all $\varphi \in W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$. The corresponding real number λ is called an eigenvalue of (7).

Obviously, if u is an eigenfunction associated to λ, then

$$\lambda = \frac{\displaystyle\int_\Omega F^p(\nabla u) \, dx}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |u|^p \, dx} > 0.$$

3.1 The first eigenvalue

Among the eigenvalues of (7), the smallest one, denoted here by $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$, has the following well-known variational characterization:

$$\lambda_1(p,\Omega) = \min_{\varphi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\displaystyle\int_\Omega F^p(\nabla\varphi)\,dx}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |\varphi|^p\,dx}. \tag{9}$$

In the following theorems its main properties are recalled.

Theorem 3.1. *If Ω is a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geqslant 2$, there exists a function $u_1 \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)\cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ which achieves the minimum in (9), and satisfies the problem (7) with $\lambda = \lambda_1(p,\Omega)$. Moreover, if Ω is connected, then $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$ is simple, that is the corresponding eigenfunctions are unique up to a multiplicative constant, and the first eigenfunctions have constant sign in Ω.*

Proof. The proof can be immediately adapted from the case of Ω connected and we refer the reader, for example, to [L, BFK]. □

Theorem 3.2. *Let Ω be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geqslant 2$. Let $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be an eigenfunction of (7) associated to an eigenvalue λ. If u does not change sign in Ω, then there exists a connected component Ω_0 of Ω such that $\lambda = \lambda_1(p,\Omega_0)$ and u is a first eigenfunction in Ω_0. In particular, if Ω is connected then $\lambda = \lambda_1(p,\Omega)$ and a constant sign eigenfunction is a first eigenfunction.*

Proof. If Ω is connected, a proof can be found in [L, DG2]. Otherwise, if $u \geqslant 0$ in Ω disconnected, by the maximum principle u must be either positive or identically zero in each connected component of Ω. Hence there exists a connected component Ω_0 such that u coincides in Ω_0 with a positive eigenfunction relative to λ. By the previous case, $\lambda = \lambda_1(p,\Omega_0)$ and the proof is completed. □

Here we list some other useful and interesting properties that can be proved in a similar way than the Euclidean case.

Proposition 3.3. *Let Ω be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geqslant 2$, the following properties hold.*

1. *For $t > 0$ it holds $\lambda_1(p, t\Omega) = t^{-p}\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$.*
2. *If $\Omega_1 \subseteq \Omega_2 \subseteq \Omega$, then $\lambda_1(p,\Omega_1) \geqslant \lambda_1(p,\Omega_2)$.*
3. *For all $1 < p < s < +\infty$ we have $p[\lambda_1(p,\Omega)]^{1/p} < s[\lambda_1(s,\Omega)]^{1/s}$.*

Proof. The first two properties are immediate from (9). As regards the third property, the inequality derives from the Hölder inequality, similarly as in [L1]. Indeed, taking $\phi = |\psi|^{\frac{s}{p}-1}\psi$, $\psi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)\cap L^\infty(\Omega)$, $\psi \geqslant 0$, we have by (4) that

$$[\lambda_1(p,\Omega)]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leqslant \frac{s}{p}\left(\frac{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |\psi|^{s-p}F^p(\nabla\psi)dx}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |\psi|^s dx}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leqslant \frac{s}{p}\left(\frac{\displaystyle\int_\Omega F^s(\nabla\psi)dx}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |\psi|^s dx}\right)^{\frac{1}{s}}$$

By minimizing with respect to ψ, we get the thesis. □

In addition, the Faber-Krahn inequality for $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$ holds.

Theorem 3.4. *Let Ω be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geqslant 2$, then*

$$|\Omega|^{p/N}\lambda_1(p,\Omega) \geqslant \kappa_N^{p/N}\lambda_1(p,\mathcal{W}). \tag{10}$$

Moreover, equality sign in (10) holds if Ω is homothetic to the Wulff shape.

The proof of this inequality, contained in [BFK], is based on a symmetrization technique introduced in [AFLT] (see [ET, FV] for the equality cases).

Using the previous result we can prove the following property of $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$.

Proposition 3.5. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geqslant 2$. The first eigenvalue of (7), $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$, is isolated.*

Proof. We argue similarly as in [L2]. For completeness we give the proof. For convenience we write λ_1 instead of $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$. Let $\lambda_k \neq \lambda_1$ a sequence of eigenvalues such that

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty} \lambda_k = \lambda_1$$

Let u_k be a normalized eigenfunction associated to λ_k that is,

$$\lambda_k = \int_\Omega F^p(\nabla u_k)\,dx \quad \text{and} \quad \int_\Omega |u_k|^p\,dx = 1 \tag{11}$$

By (11), there exists a function $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that, up to a subsequence

$$u_k \to u \quad \text{in } L^p(\Omega) \quad \nabla u_k \rightharpoonup \nabla u \text{ weakly in } L^p(\Omega).$$

By the strong convergence of u_k in $L^p(\Omega)$ and, recalling that F is convex, by weak lower semicontinuity, it follows that

$$\int_\Omega |u|^p\,dx = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_\Omega F^p(\nabla u)\,dx \leqslant \lim_{k\to\infty} \lambda_k = \lambda_1.$$

Hence, u is a first eigenfunction. On the other hand, being u_k not a first eigenfunction, by Theorem 3.2 it has to change sign. Hence, the sets $\Omega_k^+ = \{u_k > 0\}$ and $\Omega_k^- = \{u_k < 0\}$ are nonempty and, as a consequence of the Faber-Krahn inequality and of Theorem 3.2, it follows that

$$\lambda_k = \lambda_1(p,\Omega_k^+) \geqslant \frac{C_{n,F}}{|\Omega_k^+|^{\frac{p}{n}}}, \qquad \lambda_k = \lambda_1(p,\Omega_k^-) \geqslant \frac{C_{n,F}}{|\Omega_k^-|^{\frac{p}{n}}}.$$

This implies that both $|\Omega_k^+|$ and $|\Omega_k^-|$ cannot vanish as $k \to +\infty$ and finally, that u_k converges to a function u which changes sign in Ω. This is in contradiction with the characterization of the first eigenfunctions, and the proof is completed. □

3.2 Higher eigenvalues

First of all, we recall the following result (see [F, Theorem 1.4.1] and the references therein), which assures the existence of infinite eigenvalues of $-\mathcal{Q}_p$. We use the following notation. Let S^{n-1} be the unit Euclidean sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and

$$M = \{u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) : \int_\Omega |u|^p\,dx = 1\}. \tag{12}$$

Moreover, let $\mathcal{C}_n$ be the class of all odd and continuous mappings from S^{n-1} to M. Then, for any fixed $f \in \mathcal{C}_n$, we have $f : \omega \in S^{n-1} \mapsto f_\omega \in M$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let Ω a bounded open set of $\mathbb{R}^n$, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the value*

$$\tilde{\lambda}_k(p,\Omega) = \inf_{f\in\mathcal{C}_n} \max_{\omega\in S^{n-1}} \int_\Omega F^p(\nabla f_\omega)dx$$

is an eigenvalue of $-Q_p$. Moreover,

$$0 < \tilde{\lambda}_1(p,\Omega) = \lambda_1(p,\Omega) \leqslant \tilde{\lambda}_2(p,\Omega) \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \tilde{\lambda}_k(p,\Omega) \leqslant \tilde{\lambda}_{k+1}(p,\Omega) \leqslant \ldots,$$

and

$$\tilde{\lambda}_k(p,\Omega) \to \infty \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$

Hence, we have at least a sequence of eigenvalues of $-Q_p$. Furthermore, the following proposition holds.

Proposition 3.7. *Let Ω a bounded open set of $\mathbb{R}^n$. The spectrum of $-Q_p$ is a closed set.*

Proof. Let λ_k be a sequence of eigenvalues converging to $\mu < +\infty$ and let u_k be the corresponding normalized eigenfunctions, that is such that $\|u_k\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = 1$. We have to show that μ is an eigenvalue of $-Q_p$.

We have that

$$\int_\Omega \langle F^{p-1}(\nabla u_k)\nabla_\xi F(\nabla u_k), \nabla\varphi\rangle dx = \lambda_k \int_\Omega |u_k|^{p-2}u_k\varphi\, dx \tag{13}$$

for any test function $\varphi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Since

$$\lambda_k = \int_\Omega F^p(\nabla u_k)\, dx,$$

and being λ_k a convergent sequence, up to a subsequence we have that there exists a function $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that $u_k \to u$ strongly in $L^p(\Omega)$ and $\nabla u_k \rightharpoonup \nabla u$ weakly in $L^p(\Omega)$. Our aim is to prove that u is an eigenfunction relative to λ.

Choosing $\varphi = u_k - u$ as test function in the equation solved by u_k, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega \langle F^{p-1}(\nabla u_k)\nabla_\xi F(\nabla u_k) - F^{p-1}(\nabla u)\nabla_\xi F(\nabla u), \nabla(u_k-u)\rangle dx\\ &= \lambda_k \int_\Omega |u_k|^{p-2}u_k(u_k-u)\, dx - \int_\Omega F^{p-1}(\nabla u)\langle \nabla_\xi F(\nabla u), \nabla(u_k-u)\rangle dx.\end{aligned}$$

By the strong convergence of u_k and the weak one of ∇u_k, the right-hand side of the above identity goes to zero as k diverges. Hence

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Omega \langle F^{p-1}(\nabla u_k)\nabla_\xi F(\nabla u_k) - F^{p-1}(\nabla u)\nabla_\xi F(\nabla u), \nabla(u_k-u)\rangle dx = 0$$

By nowadays standard arguments, this limit implies the strong convergence of the gradient, hence we can pass to the limit under the integral sign in (13) to obtain

$$\int_\Omega \langle F^{p-1}(\nabla u)F_\xi(\nabla u), \nabla\varphi\rangle\, dx = \lambda \int_\Omega |u|^{p-2}u\varphi\, dx$$

This shows that λ is an eigenvalue and the proof is completed. □

Finally, we list some properties of the eigenfunctions, well-known in the Euclidean case (see for example [L2, AFT]). Recall that a nodal domain of an eigenfunction u is a connected component of $\{u > 0\}$ or $\{u < 0\}$.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $p > 1$, and let Ω be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then the following facts hold.*

(i) Any eigenfunction of $-\mathcal{Q}_p$ has only a finite number of nodal domains.

(ii) Let λ be an eigenvalue of $-\mathcal{Q}_p$, and u be a corresponding eigenfunction. The following estimate holds:

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leqslant C_{n,p,F}\lambda^{\frac{n}{p}}\|u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \tag{14}$$

where $C_{n,p,F}$ is a constant depending only on n, p and F.

(iii) All the eigenfunctions of (1) are in $C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$, for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

Proof. Let λ be an eigenvalue of $-\mathcal{Q}_p$, and u a corresponding eigenfunction.

In order to prove (i), let us denote by Ω_j^+ a connected component of the set $\Omega^+ := \{u > 0\}$. Being $\lambda = \lambda_1(\Omega_j^+)$, then by (10)

$$|\Omega_j^+| \geqslant C_{n,p,F}\lambda^{-\frac{n}{p}}.$$

Then, the thesis follows observing that

$$|\Omega| \geqslant \sum_j |\Omega_j^+| \geqslant C_{n,p,F}\lambda^{-\frac{n}{p}} \sum_j 1.$$

In order to prove (ii), let $k > 0$, and choose $\varphi(x) = \max\{u(x) - k, 0\}$ as test function in (8). Then

$$\int_{A_k} F^p(\nabla u)\, dx = \lambda \int_{A_k} |u|^{p-2}u(u-k)\, dx \tag{15}$$

where $A_k = \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > k\}$. Being $k|A_k| \leqslant \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$, then $|A_k| \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. By the inequality $a^{p-1} \leqslant 2^{p-1}(a-k)^{p-1} + 2^{p-1}k^{p-1}$, we have

$$\int_{A_k} |u|^{p-2}u(u-k)\, dx \leqslant 2^{p-1}\int_{A_k} (u-k)^p\, dx + 2^{p-1}k^{p-1}\int_{A_k} (u-k)\, dx. \tag{16}$$

By Poincaré inequality and property (5), then (15) and (16) give that

$$(1 - \lambda C_{n,p,F}|A_k|^{p/n})\int_{A_k} (u-k)^p\, dx \leqslant \lambda|A_k|^{p/n}C_{n,p,F}k^{p-1}\int_{A_k} (u-k)\, dx.$$

By choosing k sufficiently large, the Hölder inequality implies

$$\int_{A_k} (u-k)\, dx \leqslant \tilde{C}_{n,p,F}\lambda^{\frac{1}{p-1}}k|A_k|^{1+\frac{p}{n(p-1)}}.$$

This estimate allows to apply [LU, Lemma 5.1, p. 71] in order to get the boundedness of $\operatorname{ess\,sup} u$. Similar argument gives that $\operatorname{ess\,inf} u$ is bounded.

Since (14) holds, by standard elliptic regularity theory (see e.g. [LU]) the eigenfunction is $C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$. □

4 THE SECOND DIRICHLET EIGENVALUE OF $-\mathcal{Q}_p$

If Ω is a bounded domain, Proposition 3.5 assures that the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$ of (1) is isolated. This suggests the following definition.

Definition 3. *Let Ω be a bounded open set of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then the second eigenvalue of $-\mathcal{Q}_p$ is*

$$\lambda_2(p,\Omega) := \begin{cases} \min\{\lambda > \lambda_1(p,\Omega) : \lambda \text{ is an eigenvalue}\} & \text{if } \lambda_1(p,\Omega) \text{ is simple} \\ \lambda_1(p,\Omega) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 4.1. If Ω is connected, by theorems 3.1 and 3.2 we deduce the following characterization of the second eigenvalue:

$$\lambda_2(p,\Omega) = \min\{\lambda : \lambda \text{ admits a sign-changing eigenfunction}\}. \tag{17}$$

We point out that in [F] it is proved that in a bounded open set it holds

$$\lambda_2(p,\Omega) = \tilde{\lambda}_2(p,\Omega) = \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma_\Omega(u_1,-u_1)} \max_{u\in\gamma([0,1])} \int_\Omega F^p(\nabla u(x))\,dx \tag{18}$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_2(p,\Omega)$ is given in Proposition 3.6, and

$$\Gamma_\Omega(u,v) = \{\gamma : [0,1] \to M : \gamma \text{ is continuous and } \gamma(0) = u,\ \gamma(1) = v\},$$

with M as in (12). As immediate consequence of (18) we get

Proposition 4.2. *If $\Omega_1 \subseteq \Omega_2 \subseteq \Omega$, then $\lambda_2(p,\Omega_1) \geqslant \lambda_2(p,\Omega_2)$.*

By adapting the method contained in [CDG1, CDG2], it is possible to prove the following result.

Proposition 4.3. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The eigenfunctions associated to $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$ admit exactly two nodal domains.*

Proof. We will proceed as in the proof of [CDG2, Th. 2.1]. In such a case, $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$ is characterized as in (17). Then any eigenfunction u_2 has to change sign, and it admits at least two nodal domains $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega^+$ and $\Omega_2 \subset \Omega^-$. Let us assume, by contradiction, the existence of a third nodal domain Ω_3 and let us suppose, without loss of generality, that $\Omega_3 \subset \Omega^+$.
Claim. There exists a connected open set $\widetilde{\Omega}_2$, with $\Omega_2 \subset \widetilde{\Omega}_2 \subset \Omega$ such that $\widetilde{\Omega}_2 \cap \Omega_1 = \emptyset$ or $\widetilde{\Omega}_2 \cap \Omega_3 = \emptyset$.

The proof of the claim follows line by line as in [CDG2, Th. 2.1]. One of the main tool is the Hopf maximum principle, that for the operator $-\mathcal{Q}_p$ is proved for example in [CT, Th. 2.1].

Now, without loss of generality, we assume that $\widetilde{\Omega}_2$ is disjoint of Ω_1 and from this fact a contradiction is derived.

By the fact that u_2 does not change sign on the nodal domains and by Proposition 4.2, we have that $\lambda_1(p,\Omega_1) = \lambda_2(p,\Omega)$ and that $\lambda_1(p,\widetilde{\Omega}_2) < \lambda_1(p,\Omega_2) = \lambda_2(p,\Omega)$. Now, we may construct the disjoint sets $\widetilde{\widetilde{\Omega}}_2$ and $\widetilde{\Omega}_1$ such that $\Omega_2 \subset \widetilde{\widetilde{\Omega}}_2 \subset \widetilde{\Omega}_2$ and $\Omega_1 \subset \widetilde{\Omega}_1$, in order to have

$$\lambda_1(p,\widetilde{\Omega}_1) < \lambda_2(p,\Omega), \qquad \lambda_1(p,\widetilde{\widetilde{\Omega}}_2) < \lambda_2(p,\Omega).$$

Now let v_1 and v_2 be the extension by zero outside $\widetilde{\Omega}_1$ and $\widetilde{\widetilde{\Omega}}_2$, respectively, of the positive normalized eigenfunctions associated to $\lambda_1(p,\widetilde{\Omega}_1)$ and $\lambda(p,\widetilde{\widetilde{\Omega}}_2)$. Hence we easily verify that the function $v = v_1 - v_2$ belongs to $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, it changes sign and satisfies

$$\frac{\int_\Omega F^p(\nabla v_+)\,dx}{\int_\Omega v_+^p\,dx} < \lambda_2(p,\Omega), \quad \frac{\int_\Omega F^p(\nabla v_-)\,dx}{\int_\Omega v_-^p\,dx} < \lambda_2(p,\Omega).$$

The final aim is to construct a path $\gamma([0,1])$ such

$$\max_{u\in\gamma([0,1])}\int_\Omega F^p(\nabla u(x))\,dx < \lambda_2(p,\Omega),$$

obtaining a contradiction from (18). The construction of this path follows adapting the method contained in [CDG1, CDG2].

□

Remark 4.4. In order to better understand the behavior of $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$ and $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$ on disconnected sets, an meaningful model is given when

$$\Omega = \mathcal{W}_{r_1}\cup\mathcal{W}_{r_2},\ \text{with } r_1,r_2>0 \text{ and } \mathcal{W}_{r_1}\cap\mathcal{W}_{r_2}=\emptyset.$$

We distinguish two cases.

CASE $r_1 < r_2$. We have

$$\lambda_1(p,\Omega)=\lambda_1(p,\mathcal{W}_{r_2}).$$

Hence $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$ is simple, and any eigenfunction is identically zero on $\mathcal{W}_1$ and has constant sign in $\mathcal{W}_2$. Moreover,

$$\lambda_2(p,\Omega)=\min\{\lambda_1(p,\mathcal{W}_{r_1}),\lambda_2(p,\mathcal{W}_{r_2})\}.$$

Hence, if r_1 is not too small, then the second eigenvalue is $\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_{r_1})$, and the second eigenfunctions of Ω coincide with the first eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{W}_{r_1}$, that do not change sign in $\mathcal{W}_{r_1}$, and vanish on $\mathcal{W}_{r_2}$.

CASE $r_1 = r_2$. We have

$$\lambda_1(p,\Omega)=\lambda_1(p,\mathcal{W}_{r_i}),\quad i=1,2.$$

The first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$ is not simple: choosing, for example, the function $U = u_1\chi_{\mathcal{W}_{r_1}} - u_2\chi_{\mathcal{W}_{r_2}}$, where u_i, $i=1,2$, is the first normalized eigenfunction of $\lambda_1(p,\mathcal{W}_{r_i})$, and $V = u_1\chi_{\mathcal{W}_{r_1}}$, then U and V are two nonproportional eigenfunctions relative to $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$. Hence, in this case, by definition,

$$\lambda_2(p,\Omega)=\lambda_1(p,\Omega)=\lambda_1\left(p,\mathcal{W}_{r_i}\right).$$

In order to prove the Hong-Krahn-Szego inequality, we need the following key lemma.

Proposition 4.5. *Let Ω be an open bounded set of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exists two disjoint domains Ω_1,Ω_2 of Ω such that*

$$\lambda_2(p,\Omega)=\max\{\lambda_1(p,\Omega_1),\lambda_1(p,\Omega_2)\}.$$

Proof. Let $u_2\in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be a second normalized eigenfunction. First of all, suppose that u_2 changes sign in Ω. Then, consider two nodal domains $\Omega_1\subseteq\Omega_+$ and $\Omega_2\subseteq\Omega_-$. By definition, Ω_1 and Ω_2 are connected sets. The restriction of u_2 to Ω_1 is, by Theorem 3.2, a first eigenfunction for Ω_1 and hence $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)=\lambda_1(p,\Omega_1)$. Analogously for Ω_2, hence

$$\lambda_2(p,\Omega)=\lambda_1(p,\Omega_1)=\lambda_1(p,\Omega_2),$$

and the proof of the proposition is completed, in the case u_2 changes sign.

In the case that u_2 has constant sign in Ω, for example $u_2 \geqslant 0$, then by Theorem 3.2 Ω must be disconnected. If $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$ is simple, by definition $\lambda_2(p,\Omega) > \lambda_1(p,\Omega)$. Otherwise, $\lambda_1(p,\Omega) = \lambda_2(p,\Omega)$. Hence in both cases, we can consider a first nonnegative normalized eigenfunction u_1 not proportional to u_2.

Observe that in any connected component of Ω, by the Harnack inequality, u_i, $i = 1,2$, must be positive or identically zero. Hence we can choose two disjoint connected open sets Ω_1 and Ω_2, contained respectively in $\{x \in \Omega\colon u_1(x) > 0\}$ and $\{x \in \Omega\colon u_2(x) > 0\}$. Then, u_1 and u_2 are first Dirichlet eigenfunctions in Ω_1 and Ω_2, respectively, and

$$\lambda_1(p,\Omega) = \lambda_1(p,\Omega_1) \leqslant \lambda_2(p,\Omega), \qquad \lambda_2(p,\Omega) = \lambda_1(p,\Omega_2),$$

and the proof is completed. □

Now we are in position to prove the Hong-Krahn-Szego inequality for $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$.

Theorem 4.6. *Let Ω be a bounded open set of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then*

$$\lambda_2(p,\Omega) \geqslant \lambda_2(p,\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}), \tag{19}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$ is the union of two disjoint Wulff shapes, each one of measure $\frac{|\Omega|}{2}$. Moreover equality sign in (19) occurs if Ω is the disjoint union of two Wulff shapes of the same measure.

Proof. Let Ω_1 and Ω_2 given by Proposition 4.5. By the Faber-Krahn inequality we have

$$\lambda_2(p,\Omega) = \max\{\lambda_1(p,\Omega_1),\lambda_1(p,\Omega_2)\} \geqslant \max\{\lambda_1(p,\mathcal{W}_{r_1}),\lambda_1(p,\mathcal{W}_{r_2})\}$$

with $|\mathcal{W}_{r_i}| = |\Omega_i|$. By the rescaling property of $\lambda_1(p,\cdot)$, and observing that, being Ω_1 and Ω_2 disjoint subsets of Ω, $|\Omega_1| + |\Omega_2| \leqslant |\Omega|$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\max\{\lambda_1(p,\mathcal{W}_{r_1}),\lambda_1(p,\mathcal{W}_{r_2})\} = \lambda_1(p,\mathcal{W})\kappa_n^{\frac{p}{n}} \max\left\{|\Omega_1|^{-\frac{p}{n}},|\Omega_2|^{-\frac{p}{n}}\right\} \geqslant \\ \geqslant \lambda_1(p,\mathcal{W})\kappa_n^{\frac{p}{n}}\left(\frac{|\Omega|}{2}\right)^{-\frac{p}{n}} = \lambda_1(p,\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}).\end{aligned}$$

□

5 THE LIMIT CASE $p \to \infty$

In this section we derive some information on $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$ as p goes to infinity. First of all we recall some known result about the limit of the first eigenvalue. Let us consider a bounded open set Ω.

The anisotropic distance of $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ to the boundary of Ω is the function

$$d_F(x) = \inf_{y\in\partial\Omega} F^o(x-y), \quad x \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

We stress that when $F = |\cdot|$ then $d_F = d_{\mathcal{E}}$, the Euclidean distance function from the boundary.

It is not difficult to prove that d_F is a uniform Lipschitz function in $\overline{\Omega}$ and

$$F(\nabla d_F(x)) = 1 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Obviously, $d_F \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$. Let us consider the quantity

$$\rho_F = \max\{d_F(x),\ x \in \overline{\Omega}\}.$$

If Ω is connected, ρ_F is called the anisotropic inradius of Ω. If not, ρ_F is the maximum of the inradii of the connected components of Ω.

For further properties of the anisotropic distance function we refer the reader to [CM].

Remark 5.1. It is easy to prove (see also [JLM, BKJ]) that the distance function satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\rho_F(\Omega)} = \frac{1}{\|d_F\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}} = \min_{\varphi \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\Omega)\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\|F(\nabla\varphi)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}. \tag{20}$$

Indeed it is sufficient to observe that if $\varphi \in C_0^1(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$, then $\varphi \in C_0^1(\Omega_i) \cap C(\overline{\Omega}_i)$, for any connected component Ω_i of Ω. Then for a.e. $x \in \Omega_i$, for $y \in \partial\Omega_i$ which achieves $F^o(x-y) = d_F(x)$, it holds

$$|\varphi(x)| = |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| = |\langle \nabla\varphi(\xi), x-y\rangle| \leqslant$$
$$\leqslant F(\nabla\varphi(\xi))\, F^o(x-y) \leqslant \|F(\nabla\varphi)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} d_F(x).$$

Passing to the supremum and by density we get (20).

The following result holds (see [BKJ, JLM]).

Theorem 5.2. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and let $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$ be the first eigenvalue of (7). Then*

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} \lambda_1(p,\Omega)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \frac{1}{\rho_F(\Omega)}.$$

Now let us define

$$\Lambda_1(\infty,\Omega) = \frac{1}{\rho_F(\Omega)}.$$

The value $\Lambda_1(\infty,\Omega)$ is related to the so-called anisotropic infinity Laplacian operator defined in [BKJ], that is

$$\mathcal{Q}_\infty u = \langle \nabla^2 u\, J(\nabla u), J(\nabla u)\rangle,$$

where $J(\xi) = \frac{1}{2}\nabla_\xi\left[F^2\right](\xi)$. Note that we mean, by continuous extension, $J(0) = 0$. This is possible being F 1-homogeneous and $F(0) = 0$.

Indeed, in [BKJ] the following result is proved.

Theorem 5.3. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then, there exists a positive solution $u_\infty \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ which satisfies, in the viscosity sense, the following problem:*

$$\begin{cases} \min\{F(\nabla u) - \Lambda u, -\mathcal{Q}_\infty u\} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

with $\Lambda = \Lambda_1(\infty,\Omega)$. Moreover, any positive solution $v \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ to (21) with $\Lambda = \Lambda_1(\infty,\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\frac{\|F(\nabla v)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}} = \min_{\varphi \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\Omega)\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\|F(\nabla\varphi)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}} = \Lambda_1(\infty,\Omega) = \frac{1}{\rho_F(\Omega)}.$$

Finally, if problem (21) admits a positive viscosity solution in Ω, then $\Lambda = \Lambda_1(\infty,\Omega)$.

Proposition 5.4. *Theorem 5.2 holds also when Ω is a bounded open set of $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. Suppose that Ω is not connected, and consider a connected component Ω_0 of Ω with anisotropic inradius $\rho_F(\Omega)$. By the monotonicity property of $\lambda_1(p,\Omega)$ given in Proposition 3.3, we have

$$\lambda_1(p,\Omega) \leqslant \lambda_1(p,\Omega_0).$$

Then up to a subsequence, passing to the limit as $p \to +\infty$ and using Theorem 5.2 we have

$$\tilde{\Lambda} = \lim_{p_j \to \infty} \lambda_1(p_j, \Omega)^{\frac{1}{p_j}} \leqslant \frac{1}{\rho_F(\Omega)}. \tag{22}$$

In order to prove that $\tilde{\Lambda} = \rho_F(\Omega)^{-1}$, let u_{p_j} the first nonnegative normalized eigenfunction associated to $\lambda_1(p_j, \Omega)$. Reasoning as in [BKJ], the sequence u_{p_j} converges to a function u_∞ in $C^0(\Omega)$ which is a viscosity solution of (21) associated to $\tilde{\Lambda}$. Then by the maximum principle contained in [BB, Lemma 3.2], in each connected component of Ω, u_∞ is either positive or identically zero. Denoting by $\tilde{\Omega}$ a connected component of $\{u_\infty > 0\}$, by the uniform convergence, for p_j large, also u_{p_j} is positive in $\tilde{\Omega}$. Then by Theorem 3.2 we have

$$\lambda_1(p_j, \tilde{\Omega}) = \lambda_1(p_j, \Omega), \quad \text{and then} \quad \frac{1}{\rho_F(\tilde{\Omega})} = \tilde{\Lambda}.$$

By (22) and by definition of ρ_F, $\tilde{\Lambda} \leqslant \rho_F(\Omega)^{-1} \leqslant \rho_F(\tilde{\Omega})^{-1} = \tilde{\Lambda}$; then necessarily $\tilde{\Lambda} = \rho_F(\Omega)^{-1}$. □

In order to define the eigenvalue problem for $\mathcal{Q}_\infty$, let us consider the following operator

$$\mathcal{A}_\Lambda(s, \xi, X) = \begin{cases} \min\{F(\xi) - \Lambda s, -\langle X J(\xi), J(\xi)\rangle\} & \text{if } s > 0, \\ -\langle X J(\xi), J(\xi)\rangle & \text{if } s = 0, \\ \max\{-F(\xi) - \Lambda s, -\langle X J(\xi), J(\xi)\rangle\} & \text{if } s < 0, \end{cases}$$

with $(s, \xi, X) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times S^{n\times n}$, where $S^{n\times n}$ denotes the space of real, symmetric matrices of order n. Clearly $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda$ is not continuous in $s = 0$.

For completeness we recall the definition of viscosity solution for the operator $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda$.

Definition 4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ a bounded open set. A function $u \in C(\Omega)$ is a viscosity subsolution (resp. supersolution) of $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda(x, u, \nabla u) = 0$ if*

$$\mathcal{A}_\Lambda(\phi(x), \nabla\phi(x), \nabla^2\phi(x)) \leqslant 0 \quad (\textit{resp. } \mathcal{A}_\Lambda(\phi(x), \nabla\phi(x), \nabla^2\phi(x)) \geqslant 0),$$

for every $\phi \in C^2(\Omega)$ such that $u - \phi$ has a local maximum (resp. minimum) zero at x. A function $u \in C(\Omega)$ is a viscosity solution of $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda = 0$ if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution and in this case the number Λ is called an eigenvalue for $\mathcal{Q}_\infty$.

Definition 5. *We say that $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$, $u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, $u \not\equiv 0$ is an eigenfunction for the anisotropic $\infty-$Laplacian if there exists $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mathcal{A}_\Lambda(u, \nabla u, \nabla^2 u) = 0 \quad \textit{in } \Omega \tag{23}$$

in the viscosity sense. Such value Λ will be called an eigenvalue for the anisotropic $\infty-$Laplacian.

In order to define the second eigenvalue for $\mathcal{Q}_\infty$ we introduce the following number:

$$\rho_{2,F}(\Omega) = \sup\{\rho > 0\text{: there are two disjoint Wulff shapes } \mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{W}_2 \subset \Omega \text{ of radius } \rho\},$$

and let us define

$$\Lambda_2(\infty, \Omega) = \frac{1}{\rho_{2,F}(\Omega)}.$$

Clearly

$$\Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega) \leqslant \Lambda_2(\infty, \Omega).$$

Remark 5.5. It is easy to construct open sets Ω such that $\Lambda_1(\infty,\Omega) = \Lambda_2(\infty,\Omega)$. For example, this holds when Ω coincides with the union of two disjoint Wulff shapes with same measure, or their convex envelope.

Remark 5.6. A simple example of $\rho_{2,F}(\Omega)$ is given when Ω is the union of two disjoint Wulff sets, $\Omega = \mathcal{W}_{r_1} \cup W_{r_2}$, with $r_2 \leqslant r_1$. In this case, $\Lambda_1(\infty,\Omega) = \frac{1}{r_1}$ and, if r_2 is not too small, then $\Lambda_2(\infty,\Omega) = \frac{1}{r_2}$.

Theorem 5.7. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded open set and let $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$ be the second Dirichlet eigenvalue of $-\mathcal{Q}_p$ in Ω. Then*

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} \lambda_2(p,\Omega)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \Lambda_2(\infty,\Omega) = \frac{1}{\rho_{2,F}(\Omega)}.$$

Moreover $\Lambda_2(\infty,\Omega)$ is an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{Q}_\infty$, that is $\Lambda_2(\infty,\Omega)$ is an eigenvalue for the anisotropic infinity Laplacian in the sense of Definition 5.

Proof. First we observe that $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ is bounded from above with respect to p. More precisely we have

$$\Lambda_1(\infty,\Omega) \leqslant \limsup_{p\to\infty} \lambda_2(p,\Omega)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leqslant \Lambda_2(\infty,\Omega). \tag{24}$$

Indeed if we consider two disjoint Wulff shapes $\mathcal{W}_1$ and $\mathcal{W}_2$ of radius $\rho_{2,F}(\Omega)$, clearly $\mathcal{W}_1 \cup \mathcal{W}_2 \subset \Omega$ and then by monotonicity property (Proposition 4.2) of $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$ we have

$$\lambda_1(p,\Omega)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leqslant \lambda_2(p,\Omega)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leqslant \lambda_2(p,\mathcal{W}_1 \cup \mathcal{W}_2)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \lambda_1(p,\mathcal{W}_1)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where last equality follows from Remark 4.4. Then passing to the limit as $p \to \infty$ in the right hand side, by Theorem 5.2 we have (24). Hence there exists a sequence p_j such that $p_j \to +\infty$ as $j \to \infty$, and

$$\frac{1}{\rho_F(\Omega)} = \Lambda_1(\infty,\Omega) \leqslant \lim_{j\to\infty} \lambda_2(p_j,\Omega)^{\frac{1}{p_j}} = \overline{\Lambda} \leqslant \Lambda_2(\infty,\Omega) = \frac{1}{\rho_{2,F}(\Omega)}. \tag{25}$$

In order to conclude the proof we have to show that $\overline{\Lambda}$ is an eigenvalue for $\mathcal{Q}_\infty$ and that $\overline{\Lambda} = \Lambda_2(\infty,\Omega)$.

Let us consider $u_j \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ eigenfunction of $\lambda_2(p_j,\Omega)$ such that $\|u_j\|_{L^{p_j}(\Omega)} = 1$. Then by standard arguments u_j, converges, up to a subsequence of p_j, uniformly to a function $u \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$. The function u is a viscosity solution of (23) with $\Lambda = \bar{\Lambda}$. Indeed, let $x_0 \in \Omega$. If $u(x_0) > 0$, being u continuous, it is positive in a sufficiently small ball centered at x_0. Then it is possible to proceed exactly as in [BKJ] in order to obtain that, in the viscosity sense,

$$\min\{F(\nabla u(x_0)) - \overline{\Lambda} u(x_0), -\mathcal{Q}_\infty u(x_0)\} = 0.$$

Similarly, if $u(x_0) < 0$ then

$$\max\{-F(\nabla u(x_0)) - \overline{\Lambda} u(x_0), -\mathcal{Q}_\infty u(x_0)\} = 0.$$

It remains to consider the case $u(x_0) = 0$. We will show that u is a subsolution of (23).

Let φ a $C^2(\Omega)$ function such that $u - \varphi$ has a strict maximum point at x_0. By the definition of $\mathcal{A}_{\bar{\Lambda}}$, we have to show that $-\mathcal{Q}_\infty \varphi(x_0) \leqslant 0$.

For any j, let x_j be a maximum point of $u_j - \varphi$, so that $x_j \to x_0$ as $j \to \infty$. Such sequence exists by the uniform convergence of u_j. By [BKJ, Lemma 2.3] u_j verifies in the viscosity sense $-\mathcal{Q}_p u_j = \lambda_2(p_j, \Omega)|u_j|^{p_j-2}u_j$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\mathcal{Q}_p \varphi_j(x_j) = \\
&= -(p_j-2)F^{p_j-4}(\nabla\varphi(x_j))\langle \nabla^2\varphi(x_j)\, J(\nabla\varphi(x_j)), J(\nabla\varphi(x_j))\rangle + \\
&\qquad\qquad - F^{p_j-2}(\nabla\varphi(x_j))\nabla^2\varphi(x_j) \otimes \nabla_\xi J(\nabla\varphi(x_j)) = \\
&= -(p_j-2)F^{p_j-4}(\nabla\varphi(x_j))\mathcal{Q}_\infty\varphi(x_j) - F^{p_j-2}(\nabla\varphi(x_j))\mathcal{Q}_2\varphi(x_j) \leqslant \\
&\qquad\qquad \leqslant \lambda_2(p_j,\Omega)|u_j(x_j)|^{p_j-2}u_j(x_j);
\end{aligned}$$

here $A \otimes B := \sum_{i,k} A_{ik}B_{ik}$, for two $n \times n$ matrices A, B. If $\nabla\varphi(x_0) \neq 0$, then dividing the above inequality by $(p_j-2)F^{p_j-4}(\nabla\varphi)$ we have

$$-\mathcal{Q}_\infty\varphi(x_j) \leqslant \frac{F^2(\nabla\varphi(x_j))\mathcal{Q}_2\varphi(x_j)}{p_j-2} + \left(\frac{\lambda_2(p_j,\Omega)^{\frac{1}{p_j-4}}|u_j(x_j)|}{F(\nabla\varphi(x_j))}\right)^{p_j-4}\frac{u_j(x_j)^3}{p_j-2} =: \ell_j.$$

Passing to the limit as $j \to \infty$, recalling that $\varphi \in C^2(\Omega)$, $F \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$, $\lambda_2(p_j,\Omega)^{\frac{1}{p_j}} \to \bar{\Lambda}$, $\nabla\varphi(x_0) \neq 0$ and $u_j(x_j) \to 0$ we get

$$-\mathcal{Q}_\infty\varphi(x_0) \leqslant 0.$$

Finally, we note that if $\nabla\varphi(x_0) = 0$, the above inequality is trivially true. Hence, we can conclude that u is a viscosity subsolution.

The proof that u is also a viscosity supersolution can be done by repeating the same argument than before, considering $-u$.

Last step of the proof of the Theorem consists in showing that $\bar{\Lambda} = \Lambda_2(\infty,\Omega)$. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1: The function u changes sign in Ω.

Let us consider the following sets

$$\Omega^+ = \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > 0\} \qquad \Omega^- = \{x \in \Omega : u(x) < 0\}.$$

Being $u \in C^0(\Omega)$ then Ω^+, Ω^- are two disjoint open sets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $|\Omega^+| > 0$ and $|\Omega^-| > 0$.

By Theorem 5.3 we have

$$\overline{\Lambda} = \Lambda_1(\infty,\Omega^+) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\Lambda} = \Lambda_1(\infty,\Omega^-).$$

Then by definition of $\rho_{2,F}$ we get

$$\rho_F(\Omega^+) = \rho_F(\Omega^-) = \frac{1}{\overline{\Lambda}} \leqslant \rho_{2,F}(\Omega),$$

that implies, by (25) that

$$\overline{\Lambda} = \Lambda_2(\infty,\Omega).$$

Case 2: The function u does not change sign in Ω.

We first observe that in this case Ω cannot be connected. Indeed since u_j converges to u in $C^0(\overline{\Omega})$, for sufficiently large p we have that there exist second eigenfunctions relative to $\lambda_2(p,\Omega)$ with constant sign in Ω and this cannot happen if Ω is connected.

Then in this case, we have to replace the sequence u_j (and then the function u) in order to find two disjoint connected open subsets Ω_1, Ω_2 of Ω, such that

$$\Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega) = \Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega_1) \tag{26}$$

and

$$\overline{\Lambda} = \Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega_2). \tag{27}$$

Once we prove that such subsets exist, by (25) and the definition of $\rho_{2,F}$ we obtain

$$\rho_F(\Omega_2) = \frac{1}{\overline{\Lambda}} \leqslant \rho_{2,F}(\Omega) \leqslant \rho_F(\Omega) = \rho_F(\Omega_1),$$

that implies, again by (25),

$$\overline{\Lambda} = \Lambda_2(\infty, \Omega).$$

In order to prove (26) and (27), we consider $u_{1,\infty}$, an eigenfunction associated to $\Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega)$, obtained as limit in $C^0(\Omega)$ of a sequence $u_{1,p}$ of first normalized eigenfunctions associated to $\lambda_1(p, \Omega)$, and consider a connected component of Ω, say Ω_1, where $u_{1,\infty} > 0$ and such that $\Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega) = \Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega_1)$. The argument of the proof of Proposition 5.4 gives that such $u_{1,\infty}$ and Ω_1 exist. Then, let $u_{2,p} \geqslant 0$ be a normalized eigenfunction associated to $\lambda_2(p, \Omega)$ such that for any p sufficiently large, $\operatorname{spt}(u_{2,p}) \cap \Omega_1 = \emptyset$.

The existence of such a sequence is guaranteed from this three observations:

- if $u_{2,p}$ changes sign for a divergent sequence of p's, then we come back to the case 1;
- by the maximum principle, in each connected component of Ω $u_{2,p}$ is either positive or identically zero;
- the condition $\operatorname{spt}(u_{2,p}) \cap \Omega_1 = \emptyset$ depends from the fact that $u_{2,p}$ can be chosen not proportional to $u_{1,p}$.

Hence, there exists Ω_2 connected component of Ω disjoint from Ω_1, such that $u_{2,p}$ converges to $u_{2,\infty}$ (up to a subsequence) in $C^0(\Omega_2)$, and where $u_{2,\infty} > 0$. By Theorem 5.3, (27) holds. □

Theorem 5.8. *Given Ω bounded open set of $\mathbb{R}^n$, let $\Lambda > \Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega)$ be an eigenvalue for Q_∞. Then $\Lambda \geqslant \Lambda_2(\infty, \Omega)$ and $\Lambda_2(\infty, \Omega)$ is the second eigenvalue of Q_∞, in the sense that there are no eigenvalues of Q_∞ between $\Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega)$ and $\Lambda_2(\infty, \Omega)$.*

Proof. Let u_Λ be an eigenfunction corresponding to Λ. We distinguish two cases.
Case 1: The function u_Λ changes sign in Ω.

Let us consider the following sets

$$\Omega^+ = \{x \in \Omega : u_\Lambda(x) > 0\} \qquad \Omega^- = \{x \in \Omega : u_\Lambda(x) < 0\}.$$

Being $u_\Lambda \in C^0(\Omega)$ then Ω^+, Ω^- are two disjoint open sets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $|\Omega^+| > 0$ and $|\Omega^-| > 0$.

By Theorem 5.3 we have

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega^+) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda = \Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega^-).$$

Then by definition of $\rho_{2,F}$ we get

$$\rho_F(\Omega^+) = \rho_F(\Omega^-) = \frac{1}{\Lambda} \leqslant \rho_{2,F}(\Omega),$$

that implies, by (25) that

$$\Lambda \geqslant \Lambda_2(\infty, \Omega).$$

Case 2: The function u_Λ does not change sign in Ω.

By Theorem 5.3 Ω cannot be connected being $\Lambda > \Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega)$.

In this case, again by By Theorem 5.3 we can find two disjoint connected open subsets Ω_1, Ω_2 of Ω, such that

$$\Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega) = \Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega_1) \tag{28}$$

and

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega_2). \tag{29}$$

Being $\Lambda > \Lambda_1(\infty, \Omega)$, we obtain

$$\rho_F(\Omega_2) = \frac{1}{\Lambda} < \rho_F(\Omega) = \rho_F(\Omega_1),$$

that by the definition of $\rho_{2,F}$ implies,

$$\Lambda \geqslant \Lambda_2(\infty, \Omega).$$

□

Remark 5.9. We observe that if Ω is a bounded open set and $\widetilde{W}$ is the union of two disjoint Wulff sets with the same measure $|\Omega|/2$, it holds that

$$\rho_{2,F}(\Omega) \leqslant \rho_{2,F}(\widetilde{W}),$$

that is,

$$\Lambda_2(\infty, \Omega) \geqslant \Lambda_2(\infty, \widetilde{W}),$$

that is the Hong-Krahn-Szego inequality for the second eigenvalue of $-\mathcal{Q}_\infty$.

ACNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been partially supported by the FIRB 2013 project "Geometrical and qualitative aspects of PDE's" and by GNAMPA of INdAM.

REFERENCES

[AFLT] A.Alvino, V. Ferone, P.L. Lions, G. Trombetti. *Convex symmetrization and applications*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. non linéaire 14 (1997), 275-293. 6

[AFT] A.Alvino, V. Ferone, G. Trombetti. *On the properties of some nonlinear eigenvalues*. SIAM J. Math. Anal. 29 (1998), 437-451. 7

[BB] G. Barles, J. Busca. *Existence and comparison results for fully nonlinear degenerate elliptic equations without zeroth order term*. Comm. PDE 26 (2001): 2323–2337. 12

[BP] G. Bellettini, M. Paolini. *Anisotropic motion by mean curvature in the context of Finsler geometry*. Hokkaido Math. J., 25 (1996): 537-566. 4

[BFK] M. Belloni, V. Ferone, B. Kawohl. *Isoperimetric inequalities, Wulff shape and related questions for strongly nonlinear elliptic operators*. Z. angew. Math. Phys. ZAMP 54.5 (2003): 771-783. 2, 5, 6

[BKJ] M. Belloni, B. Kawohl, P. Juutinen. *The* p*-Laplace eigenvalue problem as* $p \to \infty$ *in a Finsler metric*. J. Eur. Math. Soc. 8 (2006): 123-138. 2, 11, 12, 14

[BF2] L.Brasco, G. Franzina. *On the Hong-Krahn-Szego inequality for the* p*-Laplace operator*. Manuscripta Math., 141.3-4 (2013): 537-557. 2

[BGM] G. Buttazzo, S. Guarino Lo Bianco, M. Marini. *Sharp estimates for the anisotropic torsional rigidity and the principal frequency*. Preprint. 2

[CM] G.Crasta, A. Malusa, *The distance function from the boundary in a Minkowski space*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 359 (2007), 5725–5759. 11

[CDG1] M. Cuesta, D. De Figueiredo, J-P. Gossez. *The beginning of the Fučik spectrum for the* p*-Laplacian.* J. Diff. Eq. 159.1 (1999): 212-238. 9

[CDG2] M. Cuesta, D. G. De Figueiredo, Jean-Pierre Gossez. *A nodal domain property for the* p*-Laplacian*. Comptes Rendus Acad. Sc.-Ser. I-Math. 330 (2000): 669-673. 9

[CT] M. Cuesta, P. Takac. *A strong comparison principle for positive solutions of degenerate elliptic equations*. Diff. Int. Eq. 13 (2000): 721-746. 9

[DG] F. Della Pietra, N. Gavitone *Symmetrization for Neumann anisotropic problems and related questions*. Adv. Nonlinear Stud. 12(2), 219?235 (2012). 2

[DG2] F. Della Pietra, N. Gavitone. *Faber-Krahn inequality for anisotropic eigenvalue problems with Robin boundary conditions*. Potential Anal. 41(2014):1147-1166. 2, 5

[DG3] F. Della Pietra, N. Gavitone. *Sharp bounds for the first eigenvalue and the torsional rigidity related to some anisotropic operators*. Math. Nachr. 287 (2014): 194-209. 2

[DGP] F. Della Pietra, N. Gavitone, G. Piscitelli, *A sharp weighted anisotropic Poincaré inequality for convex domains*, preprint. 2

[ET] L. Esposito and C. Trombetti. *Convex symmetrization and Pólya-Szegö inequality*. Nonlinear Anal. TMA, 56 (2004):43–62. 6

[FV] A. Ferone, R. Volpicelli. *Convex rearrangement: equality cases in the Pólya-Szegö inequality*. Calc. Var. PDE, 21 (2004):259-272. 6

[F] G. Franzina. *Existence, uniqueness, optimization and stability for low eigenvalues of some nonlinear operators*. PhD thesis. 2, 6, 9

[JL] P. Juutinen, P. Lindqvist. *On the higher eigenvalues for the* ∞*-eigenvalue problem*. Calc. Var. 23 (2005): 169-192. 3

[JLM] P. Juutinen, P. Lindqvist and J. Manfredi. *The* ∞*-eigenvalue problem.* Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. 148 (1999): 89-105. 2, 11, 12

[KN] B. Kawohl, M. Novaga. *The* p*-Laplace eigenvalue problem as* $p \to 1$ *and Cheeger sets in a Finsler metric*. J. Convex. Anal. 15 (2008):623-634. 2

[LU] O. Ladyzhenskaya, N. Ural'tseva. *Linear and quasilinear elliptic equations*, Academic Press, New York, 1968. 8

[L] P. Lindqvist, *On the equation div* $(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) + \lambda |u|^{p-2}u = 0$. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 109 (1990), 157-164. 5

[L1] P. Lindqvist. *On nonlinear Rayleigh quotient*. Potential Anal. 2 (1993): 199-218. 5

[L2] P. Lindqvist. *A nonlinear eigenvalue problem*. Topics in mathematical analysis 3 (2008): 175-203. 2, 6, 7

[P] G. Piscitelli. *A nonlocal anisotropic eigenvalue problem.* Diff. Int. Eq. 29 (2016), 1001-1020. 2

[WX] G. Wang, C. Xia. *An optimal anisotropic Poincaré inequality for convex domains*. Pacific J. Math. 258 (2012):305-326 2